

### REMARKS

The applicant's remarks below, are preceded by quotations of related comments of the examiner, in small, bold-face, type

**Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill to run a supervisor process that allows indirect access by a mobile program to service facilities (as in claim 1), with respect to the cited Antes and Steinburg references.**

**Steinberg teaches an operating environment running a supervisor process [e. g., administrative knowbots, page 3, line 31] that allows the mobile program indirect access to make use of the service facilities [page 31.]**

**It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the system taught by Antes by implementing the improvements detailed above because it would provide Antes's system with the enhanced capability of keeping unauthorized users out [e. g., page 3, line 41.]**

As previously argued, "administrative Knowbots" that "police the system, keeping unauthorized users out" must necessarily intercede between system access requests (e. g., from other "Knowbots") and the underlying local system service facilities. Steinberg teaches administrative Knowbots that police the system and keep unauthorized users out; however, authorized users are allowed access, albeit "indirect access" through "administrative Knowbots" that perform the disclosed security function.

The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Linter*, 458 F. 2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972); *In re Dillon*, 919 F. 2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1990) cert. denied, 500 U. S. 904 (1991).

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the service facilities are included in the mobile program operating environment and that what the supervisor process allows is indirect access to the service facilities of the operating environment. The administrative Knowbots referred to by Steinberg were meant to prevent access by the users, not to the mobile program operating environment service facilities, but rather to information such as "a Personal Library Systems (PLS), a miniature database for storing private notes, collected research documents, and other information." Neither Steinberg nor Anthes describes or suggests controlling access to service facilities of an operating environment.

**With respect to claims 18 &19, the Examiner provided a FAX copy of the cited Orfali reference in response to a telephone request by Applicant.**

**Orfali teaches maintaining a name space that uniquely identifies types of information to be interchanged as part of the communication [e. g., page 3, #7, i. e., "Register the run-time objects with the implementation repository -see " the disclosed "object reference 1, "and using a name within the name space to identify a type of information to be interchanged [e. g., page 3, #7, i. e., "Register the run-time objects with the implementation repository "].**

The applicant's claim 18 requires "using a name space that uniquely identifies types of information to be interchanged." The CORBA approach described by Orfali records the type of an object being substantiated on a server for the purpose of matching client software with service interfaces which are generally used locally and which are not interchanged or mobile. These objects are not "information to be interchanged as part of the communication," as recited in claim 18. Thus, Orfali does not describe or suggest the feature that the examiner acknowledged to be missing from Anthes and Steinberg.

Each dependent claim is patentable for at least the same reasons as the claim on which it depends. The fact that the applicant has not discussed a particular position of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes that position. The fact that the applicant has stated arguments for patentability of a claim does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims.